

### ***Remarks***

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in this application with claims 1 and 21 being independent claims. Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,812,082 to Moreira *et al.* (hereafter “the Moreira patent”). Claims 5-8 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreira patent. Claims 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreira patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,907 to Cho (hereafter “the Cho patent”). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreira patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,843 to Kirkorian *et al.* (hereafter “the Kirkorian patent”).

#### **I. Claims 10 and 11 are Not Indefinite**

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Particularly, the Examiner states that the claim elements “fast-time” and “slow-time” as used in claims 10 and 11 are “unclear”. (Office Action, page 2).

Applicants respectfully submit that the terms “fast-time” and “slow-time” have accepted meanings in the art. Particularly, the term “fast-time” connotes time in the range dimension and “slow-time” connotes time in the azimuth dimension, as is understood by those skilled in the art of synthetic aperture radar (SAR) design. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

#### **II. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 21 are Patentable Over the Moreira Patent**

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14-15, 17-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Moreira patent. Claims 5-8 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreira patent.

Claims 1 and 21 recite “performing a first partial data stabilization to a point operation on the SAR signal to generate a partially stabilized SAR signal, the first partial data stabilization including removing a high bandwidth azimuth chirp from the SAR signal”.

The Moreira patent discloses a system that processes data for use in a SAR system that is fundamentally different than the claimed invention. Specifically, the Moreira patent performs Fourier transforms on the SAR data in the processing prior to removing the azimuthal chirp, as is clear from Fig. 3., 3.14. *See also* column 6, lines 40-50. Thus, the data stabilization performed by the Moreira patent is data stabilization to a line, not “data stabilization to a point” as recited in claims 1 and 21.

Because the Moreira patent fails to disclose or suggest “performing a first partial data stabilization to a point operation on the SAR signal to generate a partially stabilized SAR signal, the first partial data stabilization including removing a high bandwidth azimuth chirp from the SAR signal”, the “partially stabilized SAR signal” being used in the claimed “along track migration operation”, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 21. Claims 2-15, and 17-18 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least these reasons.

### III. Claims 16 and 20 are Patentable over the Moreira Patent and the Cho Patent

Claims 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreira patent in view of the Cho patent.

Claims 16 and 20 depend from claim 1 and therefore, claims 16 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1 above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 16 and 20.

### IV. Claim 17 is Patentable Over the Moreira Patent in view of the Kirkorian Patent

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreira patent in view of the Kirkorian patent.


Claim 17 depends from claim 1 and therefore, claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1 above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 17.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael J. Bell, Esq. (Reg. No. 39,604)  
Andrew R. Sommer (Reg. No. 53,932)

Date: 8/26/04

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP  
Box No. 34  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2402  
(202) 783-0800